DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 154 HE 009 152

AUTHOR Curry, Denis; Johnson, Jackie.
TITLE Survey of Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits of Selected Institutions in Response to Senate Resolution 1976-209.
INSTITUTION Washington State Council for Postsecondary Education, Olympia.
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 60p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.
AVAILABLE FROM Council for Postsecondary Education, 908 E. Fifth St., Olympia, Washington 98504

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *College Teachers; *Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; *Fringe Benefits; National Surveys; *State Colleges; State Surveys; *State Universities; Statistical Data; Statistical Studies; *Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS *Washington

ABSTRACT

The survey objective was to determine the 1976-77 salaries and fringe benefits for instructional faculty with nine or ten month contracts, both at the four-year colleges and community colleges in the Washington state system and at institutions of comparable size and scope in other states. Survey groups were established for: (1) research and doctoral-granting universities; (2) comprehensive colleges and universities; and (3) two-year colleges. The 1976-77 Higher Education General Information Survey report "Employees in Institutions of Higher Education" was used as a survey form, and as the basis for the survey's definitions of faculty. In the research and doctoral granting university category, both Washington universities were below average on a composite basis, and even farther below average in most cases on rank-by-rank basis. In the comprehensive college and university survey, Washington institutions were spread throughout the ranking, and on a faculty rank-by-rank basis were again lower than their composite average. Salaries at Washington community colleges averaged 8.1 percent lower than the survey composite. Fringe benefits as a percentage of salaries were lower than the composite average for Washington institutions in all categories. (MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED142154

Council for Postsecondary Education
State of Washington

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

H200915 2

77-16

SURVEY OF

FACULTY SALARIES AND FRINGE BENEFITS

OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

in response to

Senate Resolution 1976-209

March 1977

COUNCIL FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

CITIZEN MEMBERS

Mrs. Allison S. Cowles
Chairman
Spokane

Ms. Betty Fletcher
Seattle

Walter C. Howe, Jr.
Bellevue

Robert M. Humphrey
Everett

Mrs. Ruth Shepherd
Vice-Chairman
Kennewick

Ms. Helen Thompson
Tacoma

John L. VanAelstyn
Seattle

Richard P. Wollenberg
Longview

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

James E. Brooks, President
Central Washington State College

Frank B. Brouillet, Superintendent
Office of the Superintendent of
Public Instruction

John C. Mundt, Director
State Board for Community College
Education

John Murphy, Acting Director
Commission for Vocational
Education

Philip M. Phibbs, President
University of Puget Sound

Harold Wosepka, President
Trend Systems, Inc.

STAFF

Patrick M. Callan
Executive Coordinator

William Chance, Deputy Coordinator
Planning and Research

Carl Donovan, Deputy Coordinator
Student Services

Denis J. Curry, Deputy Coordinator
Finance and Information Systems

908 E. Fifth
Olympia, Washington 98504

SURVEY OF FACULTY SALARIES AND FRINGE BENEFITS OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

in response to

Senate Resolution 1976-209

Council for Postsecondary Education

Project Officers:

Denis Curry
Jackie Johnson

March 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	1
Background	3
Council Action	4
Definitions	5
Institutional Classification	7
Criteria Relating to the Resolution	9
Application of Criteria	12
Survey Process	22
Survey Response	23
Appendices	35
Appendix A	36
Appendix B	37
Appendix C	39

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1:	States Excluded from Survey Based on 50 State Ranking of Selected Economic Indicators	12
Table 2:	Research and Doctoral Granting Universities Survey Institutions	15
Table 3:	Comprehensive Colleges and Universities Survey Institutions	18
Table 4:	Comprehensive Community Colleges with FTE Enrollments of 500 to 11,000 Computed by District FTE Totals for Multi-Campus Districts	20
Table 5:	Research and Doctoral Granting Universities Average Salary and Fringe Benefits of 9-10 Month Instructional Faculty (Ranked by Average Salary). . .	24
Table 6:	Comprehensive Colleges and Universities Average Salary and Fringe Benefits of 9-10 Month Instructional Faculty (Ranked by Average Salary). . .	26
Table 7:	Average Salary and Compensation of 9-10 Month Instructional Faculty at Community Colleges (Ranked by Average Salary).	28
Table 8:	Average Salary of 9-10 Month Instructional Faculty at Community Colleges (Ranked by State Averages).	31
Table 9:	Average Salary of 9-10 Month Instructional Faculty at Community Colleges (By FTE Enrollment Categories).	32

ABSTRACT

Senate Resolution 1976-209 directed the Council for Postsecondary Education to develop "appropriate salary survey procedures to separately determine prevailing wage rates for faculty of the four-year institutions of higher education, and of the state community colleges". The resolution stipulated that the surveys should include "information on faculty salaries and fringe benefits from appropriate public institutions in other states which are deemed to be comparable to Washington institutions in size, complexity and scope of programs and shall meet qualitative guidelines established by the Council".

Criteria for the inclusion of institutions which were surveyed relied completely on nationally published objective data which were available for all institutions of any one category. Survey groups were established for (1) research and doctoral granting universities, (2) comprehensive colleges and universities, and (3) two-year colleges.

The 1976-77 Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) report "Employees in Institutions of Higher Education" was used as the survey form and the basis for definitions of the faculty to be included in the survey. The survey objective was to determine the 1976-77 salaries and fringe benefits for 9-10 month contract instructional faculty at the selected institutions.

Institutional responses were gratifying. All of the 28 research and doctoral granting universities and the 27 comprehensive colleges and universities responded affirmatively to the request for data. Of the 190 two-year community college institutions or districts contacted, 131 (68.9 percent) provided data. The responses of the institutions surveyed are contained in Tables 5, 6, and 7 (pages 24, 26 and 28) of the report.

In the research and doctoral granting university survey, both Washington universities were below average on a composite basis (University of Washington 18th and Washington State University 27th out of 30). On a faculty rank-by-rank basis, Washington universities were even farther below average in most cases.

In the comprehensive colleges and universities survey, composite averages of Washington institutions were: The Evergreen State College 7th (out of 31); Central Washington State College 10th; Eastern Washington State College 17th; and Western Washington State College 20th. On a rank-by-rank basis, Washington institutions were again generally lower than their composite average. Salaries at Washington community colleges ranged from 5.6 percent above the survey average to 25.4 percent below the average with a composite system-wide average 8.1 percent lower than the survey average.

Fringe benefits as a percentage of salaries averaged 15.9 percent in the research and doctoral granting universities category, 16.6 percent for the comprehensive colleges and universities and 14.7 percent for the community colleges. Washington universities were both below the survey average as were three of the four state colleges. The average fringe benefits of Washington community colleges was 14.1 percent as compared to the 14.7 percent average of the survey institutions.

Background

Senate Resolution 1976-209 directed the Council for Postsecondary Education to develop "appropriate salary survey procedures to separately determine prevailing wage rates for faculty of the four-year institutions of higher education, and of the state community colleges". The resolution, contained in Appendix A, stipulated that the surveys should include "information on faculty salaries and fringe benefits from appropriate public institutions in other states which are deemed to be comparable to Washington institutions in size, complexity and scope of programs and shall meet qualitative guidelines established by the Council".

Since the State Board for Community College Education and the colleges and universities were requested by the resolution "to cooperate in the development and execution of the surveys", an advisory committee was formed to assist with this project. The role of the advisory committee, composed of institutional and agency representatives, was to provide a forum for consideration of alternative processes and procedures. The committee met on June 15 and August 10, 1976, to discuss the type of survey and related procedures and the extent and composition of possible comparison groups. Also discussed were guidelines for determining comparability of institutions relating to the criteria as set forth in the resolution. Some suggestions made by the committee were incorporated into the study and some were not. Council staff did not seek consensus or recommendations from the committee, but rather sought assistance and advice in ascertaining sources of data, parameters of comparability and reasonability of various criteria that might be used.

The resolution concentrates on institutional characteristics and did not request that an analysis of "peer" states be conducted or that an evaluation be made of the seven states which have been used for comparison purposes. Consequently, the procedures and guidelines used were related to institutions and not states with the exception of one exclusionary criteria -- substantially different economic characteristics.

Council Action

In reviewing the work of the staff in response to the resolution, the Council concurred with the procedures, process and survey composition and authorized the staff to transmit the preliminary results to the Senate in accordance with Senate Resolution 1976-209, with the understanding that a final report, including all respondents, would be prepared as soon as possible depending upon the receipt of additional responses.

At the same time, the Council wished to indicate that the comparison groups were intended to be responsive to Senate Resolution 1976-209 and that it was not its intention to suggest their use as a general comparison list for other purposes (Motion 77-16).

After extensive discussion and in recognition of the fact that the resolution was not directed toward a state-by-state analysis, the Council adopted the following motion (77-14):

> "The Council for Postsecondary Education recognizes the value of the historical comparisons with the major institutions of seven states with generally comparable political, economic and educational characteristics and recommends that this comparison be continued as one of the criteria considered by the Council, the Governor and the legislature in determining the appropriate salary funding for Washington state institutions of postsecondary education."

Overall, the Council wished to express its concern to the Senate for the quality of education in the state and that there should be no interpretation of this report which should be used to downgrade or reduce the quality of any Washington institution.

Definitions

The operational definitions pertinent to the project are as follows:

Prevailing Wage Rate: The term "prevailing rates" is used in the State Civil Service Law (RCW 41.06.160) which directs that periodic wage surveys be conducted. In this sense prevailing connotes "prevalent" or "of widespread occurrence". While arguments can be advanced for the use of a "model" approach to determine the prevailing rate, most surveys (including that conducted by the State Personnel Board and more recently, Arthur Young) determine the arithmetic mean of the salaries, wages or compensation paid to the participants in the group under study. The survey was designed to follow this approach. Current, up-to-date information is also a feature of the term "prevailing". The decision was made to ascertain the rates as of the 1976-77 academic year. The term "wage" is not entirely appropriate to faculty and thus "salary" has been used as a synonym. The resolution directed that salaries and fringe benefits be reported. Since salaries are encompassed in the "prevailing rate(s)", fringe benefits are reported separately.

Fringe Benefits: Fringe benefits are defined as "cash contributions in the form of supplementary or deferred compensation other than salary, exclusive of the employees contribution". This definition has been agreed to by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the federal government for survey purposes.

Faculty: In higher education, the application of the term "faculty" varies among institutions. In some institutions, librarians, counselors and administrative personnel are afforded faculty rank and status. In some institutions, certain instructional personnel are not deemed to be "faculty". In view of the need for "consistent reliable salary survey information" as expressed in the resolution, the term "faculty" for the purposes of the survey means "full-time instructional faculty" as defined in detail by the AAUP and the National Center for Educational Statistics.

The Carnegie Commission Higher Education Institutional Classification Code was used as a means of identifying institutions for potential inclusion in the surveys. The following definitions are taken from the Carnegie Classification Code.

Research University I: The 50 leading universities in terms of federal financial support of academic science in at least two of the three years 1968-71; awarded at least 50 PhD's plus MD's.

Research University II: The 100 leading institutions in terms of federal support in at least two of the three years; awarded at least 50 PhD's in 1969-70.

Doctoral-Granting Universities I: Institutions awarded 40 or more PhD's in 1969-70 (plus MD's if on the same campus) or received at least $3 million in total federal financial support in either 1969-70 or 1970-71. No institution is included that granted fewer than 20 PhD's (plus MD's if on the same campus), regardless of the amount of federal financial support it received.

Doctoral-Granting Universities II: Institutions awarded at least 10 PhD's in 1969-70, with the exception of a few new doctoral-granting institutions that may be expected to increase the number of PhD's awarded within a few years. In all cases, the term PhD also includes the EdD and other doctoral degrees.

Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I: Institutions with a liberal arts program and (or) engineering and business administration; at least two professional or occupational programs and 1970 enrollments over 2,000.

Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II: Institutions with a liberal arts program and at least one professional or occupational program such as teacher training or nursing.

Liberal Arts College I: Institutions which scored 5 or above on Astin's selectivity index[1] or they were included among the 200 leading baccalaureate-granting institutions in terms of numbers of their graduates receiving PhD's at 40 leading doctoral-granting institutions from 1920 to 1966. (The distinction between a liberal arts college and a comprehensive college is not clear-cut. Some of the institutions in this group have modest occupational programs but a strong liberal arts tradition.)

Liberal Arts College II: Institutions which are liberal arts colleges that did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the first group of liberal arts colleges. Again, the distinction between "liberal arts" and "comprehensive" is not clear-cut for some of the larger colleges in this group and is necessarily partly a matter of judgement.

Two-Year Colleges and Institutes: (No further definition) All Washington community colleges are included in this group.

Institutional Classification

The advisory committee suggested that Research University I and II categories be combined and that all public institutions in these categories be considered potential institutions for the survey related to the University of Washington and Washington State University which are similarly classified.

---

[1]Astin's selectivity index is based on National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test Scores for all students who took the NMSQT in 1964, classified according to the colleges of their first choice. From these distributions of scores, it was possible to estimate both the mean and the standard deviation of the scores of students actually entering each college by making certain adjustments in the data. For additional details, see Appendix C of Alexander W. Astin, Predicting Academic Performance in College (The Free Press, New York, 1971).

Source: A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973.

The committee further suggested that Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I and II be combined and that all public institutions in these categories be considered potential institutions for the state college survey. The inclusion of The Evergreen State College in this category was discussed at length at the initial meeting of the committee. In reviewing the public liberal arts college category, only nine institutions in seven states (three in California) were found to meet reasonable criteria for establishing a separate comparison group for Evergreen. Estimated average salaries of these institutions were found to be slightly higher than estimates for the comprehensive college and university group. It was agreed by the committee that The Evergreen State College should be grouped with the three older state colleges based on the fact that it is an emerging institution with a planned enrollment of 5,000 with the possibility of granting masters degrees in the future. Subsequent to this decision, the enrollment parameters of the comprehensive college and university category were broadened to encompass Washington's four state colleges.

The Carnegie Classification does not distinguish among two-year colleges and institutes, but rather includes all institutions offering two- but less than four-year programs. It was decided that locally oriented, free standing institutions, whose faculty salaries were not set by, or in conjunction with, salaries of four-year institutions would be appropriate institutions for potential inclusion in the survey. Branch campuses for four-year institutions were thus eliminated from consideration. The committee further suggested that institutions should be comprehensive in purpose and programs and should have a minimum of thirty percent enrollment in both academic and vocational programs.

Criteria Relating to the Resolution

Institutions were reviewed on the basis of Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) data through the use of the Educational Statistics (EDSTAT) on-line data base. The Council subscribes to this data base and has the capability of retrieving HEGIS data reported by all institutions nationally. This data base codes each institution by Carnegie Classification and the initial sort was based on this coding.

The resolution stated that institutions comparable to Washingtin institutions in size be considered. To meet this criteria, institutions were reviewed on the basis of the 1974-75 HEGIS Opening Fall Enrollment, the most current data available.

Complexity and scope of programs were reviewed through the 1973-74 HEGIS Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred. University data were collected on doctoral degrees awarded. Comprehensive college and university data were collected on masters degrees awarded. The criteria used was the number of degrees awarded by major area of study, e.g. agriculture and natural resources, biological sciences, education, engineering, health professions, mathematics, etc. In all, there are twenty-four such areas. Three of these areas -- law military science and theology -- showed no reported masters or doctoral degrees by any of the public institutions, leaving twenty-one broad categories.

Potential qualitative guidelines were reviewed at length and were found to be the most elusive of the criteria set forth in the resolution. While it is possible to address the quality of individual institutions based on a wide variety of attributes, there were found to be only minimal available data on objective measures of quality that could be applied to all institutions in any one category.

Information on National Merit Scholars, Scholastic Aptitude Test and

American College Testing scores, entering grade point averages and fellowships attained by faculty were all suggested as possible criteria, however, no complete data were found available for all institutions in any of these areas.

Library holdings were reviewed as suggested by the advisory committee. Preliminary data were discussed with the committee and rejected as a criteria for the inclusion or exclusion of institutions.

Qualitative guidelines established were the percentage of faculty at each institution that hold a terminal (doctoral or professional) degree. Two sources were used to provide the data. American Universities and Colleges, American Council on Education, Eleventh Edition is the most current edition published and contains data on faculty composition for 1970-71. While these data are very precise, they are also dated. Barron's Profiles of American Colleges, 1974 edition, offers similar data for 1973-74. An institution was included if it met the predetermined level of comparability from either source.

Following the initial identification of institutions in the university survey, the University of Washington offered additional criteria to be used as qualitative measures. These included membership in the American Association of Universities (AAU), inclusion among the thirty-three largest recipients of federal grants and contracts, institutions where the University of Washington faculty received their doctoral degrees and inclusion among the thirty-three public or private institutions ranked highest in quality in the 1969 Roose-Anderson Report.[2]

These were not employed as qualitative criteria for the following reasons:

(1) AAU membership is not based on objective criteria but rather on acceptance by the existing membership. It should be noted that 18 of the 23 public AAU members are included in the survey institutions.

---

[2]K.D. Roose and C.J. Anderson, A Rating of Graduate Programs (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970).

(2) The ranking of universities according to the receipt of federal grants and contracts is basically the delineation used in the Carnegie Classification of Research and Doctoral Granting Universities I and II. Public institutions in these two categories were initially used as a basic consideration in the development of the university group. While this factor is helpful in categorization, its use as a measure to exclude all but the top 17 to 20 public grant recipients implies a direct correlation between receipt of grants and instructional quality.

(3) The consideration of where the University of Washington faculty received their doctoral degrees does not directly relate to institutions to be used in a comparison. In order to use such a measure it would be necessary to determine the same information for other institutions to be considered for inclusion. Acquisition of this data was not feasible.

(4) The Roose-Anderson study was a subjective evaluation of graduate programs based on a 1969 survey.

It should be especially noted that none of these additional criteria applied to Washington State University and would have eliminated Washington State University from the survey group were it located in another state.

Economic Factors. Although not specifically mentioned in the Senate Resolution, the advisory committee urged that major economic differences between states be taken into account in determining the appropriateness of institutions for inclusion in the base to determine the prevailing wage.

Since state factors were not referenced in the resolution, it was not appropriate to limit the base to only those states which have virtually the same pattern as Washington. Rather, the states were analyzed on the basis of "tax capacity"*, tax revenue per capita and per capita personal income to

*Derived from an index developed by Robert Reischauer of the Brookings Institute.

determine if there were states which should be excluded due to substantially different economic factors. As a result, it was found that a high degree of correlation existed between these factors in the lowest quartile of states. The Council therefore excluded institutions in 12 of these states from consideration due to substantially different economic factors. Alaska was also excluded for similar reasons at the opposite end of the spectrum. Table 1 below lists the states and their rankings on the measures.

TABLE 1

STATES EXCLUDED FROM SURVEY
BASED ON 50 STATE RANKING
OF SELECTED ECONOMIC INDICATORS

	Potential Tax Revenue Per Capita[1]	Actual Tax Revenue Per Capita	Per Capita Personal Income[2] 1974	1975
Mississippi	50	46	50	50
Arkansas	46	49	48	49
South Carolina	49	48	45	47
Alabama	48	50 (tie)	47	46
West Virginia	47	50 (tie)	44	40
Kentucky	43	44	42	45
Tennessee	42	47	40	43
New Mexico	36	36	49	48
Utah	45	40	41	39
North Carolina	40	42	37	41
Louisiana	34	39	43	37
Georgia	33	35	35	44

[1]Council for Postsecondary Education, Financial Support of Higher Education In Washington, A National Comparison, April 1976.

[2]U. S. Department of Commerce.

Application of The Criteria

Based on the data sources outlined above, a sequential elimination approach was used to exclude institutions not deemed to be comparable to Washington categories of institutions. In other words, only institutions retained in step 1 were considered in step 2 and so on.

It should be clearly understood that when more than one Washington institution is included in a category, the criteria span the range of institutional characteristics. The resulting survey group may therefore contain institutions which would not have been included if the survey were constructed to fit a sin le school. For example, if a group relating only to the University of Washington were to be developed, the size and program scope measures would have been different.

Research and Doctoral Granting Universities:

Size. Total headcount enrollment (1974-75) at the University of Washington was reported as 36,234 and at Washington State University as 15,694. Parameters established for comparison institutions were a minimum headcount enrollment of 10,000 and no maximum limit. This resulted in an initial listing of 49 institutions, eliminating only Georgia Institute of Technology (8,205).

Complexity and scope of programs. Out of a possible 21 effective categories, the University of Washington granted doctorates (1973-74) in 16 major areas of study and Washington State University granted doctorates in 12 major areas of study. The advisory committee suggested an institution should grant doctorates in a minimum of one-half the major areas to fulfill this criteria of comparable breadth. The minimum of 11 was employed.

Nine universities were eliminated from further consideration based on this criteria. A review was also made of total doctorates and total first professional degrees granted. Predominately, those institutions granting doctorates in less than 11 major areas were also granting considerably less total doctorates than Washington universities and/or showed no first professional degrees granted.

Examples of eliminated institutions were Mississippi State University (7 program areas, 77 doctorates, 0 first professional); Oregon State

University (8 program areas, 272 doctorates, 0 first professional); State University of North Carolina (8 program areas, 205 doctorates, 0 first professional). Forty institutions remained as a potential sample.

Quality. In the source data used, the University of Washington reported 71.9 percent of their faculty held terminal degrees and Washington State University reported 76.7 percent of their faculty held terminal degrees. Institutions were excluded from further consideration unless over 65 percent of their faculty held terminal degrees. Eight institutions were eliminated by this criteria. They were the University of Hawaii (60.7 percent highest percentage from either source); Iowa State University, Science and Technology (61.7 percent); Kansas State University, Agriculture and Applied Science (61.6 percent); Louisiana State University (64.6 percent); University of Maryland (62.5 percent); Oklanoma State University (57.6 percent); University of Iowa ("more than half"); and University of Tennessee (65 percent). Thirty-two institutions remained following this consideration.

Economic factors. The Universities of Kentucky (Lexington), North Carolina (Chapel Hill), Utah and Georgia were excluded due to the existence of substantially different economic factors in those states.

The 28 institutions which remained in this survey category are shown on Table 2.

Comprehensive Colleges and Universities:

Institutions in this category that grant doctorate degrees were eliminated on the basis of their lack of comparability to Washington state colleges. Doctoral granting institutions included University of Alabama at Birmingham, Northern Arizona University, University of Colorado (Denver), Florida Atlantic University, Idaho State University, SUNY at Binghampton, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, South Dakota State University, Middle Tennessee State University, William and Mary Main Campus, University of New Orleans, Portland State University and Northeast Louisiana University.

TABLE 2

RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL GRANTING UNIVERSITIES
SURVEY INSTITUTIONS

	1974-75 HEADCOUNT	1973-74 DOCTORAL DEGREES BY NUMBER OF MAJOR AREAS	PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY WITH TERMINAL DEGREES*
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA	29,241	15	73.2%
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA (BERKELEY)	35,439	19	79.9%
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA (DAVIS)	17,784	11	86.2%
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA (LOS ANGELES)	39,009	15	N/A*
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO (BOULDER)	22,420	13	78.1%
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY	16,798	12	67.4%
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT (STORRS)	19,563	13	76.7%
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA	28,261	11	85.0%
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY	21,035	16	80.0%
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS (URBANA)	36,395	19	72.3%
INDIANA UNIVERSITY (BLOOMINGTON)	30,623	16	85.1%
PURDUE UNIVERSITY (LAFAYETTE)	27,838	15	87.0%
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS	22,182	14	82.3%
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS (AMHERST)	24,699	15	70.0%
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN (ANN ARBOR)	36,895	19	"Nearly All"
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	46,794	17	76.0%
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA (MINNEAPOLIS/ST. PAUL)	58,814	17	"Most"
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI	24,237	14	65.5%
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA (LINCOLN)	20,892	13	74.2%
RUTGERS (NEW BRUNSWICK)	29,653	15	66.0%
SUNY (BUFFALO)	22,227	14	86.1%
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY (COLUMBUS)	49,523	17	67.6%
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA (NORMAN)	22,496	12	75.1%
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON (EUGENE)	18,068	11	88.4%
PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY (UNIVERSITY PARK)	39,077	16	71.8%
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS (AUSTIN)	44,934	15	74.5%
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA (CHARLOTTESVILLE)	25,227	12	78.3%
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN (MADISON)	36,971	19	75.3%
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON	36,234	16	71.9%
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY	15,694	12	76.7%

*Data based on American Universities and Colleges, American Council on Education, Eleventh Edition (1970-71 data) or Barron's Profiles of American Colleges, 1974 Edition (1973-74 data) whichever was greater. University of California (Los Angeles) has been included in the survey based on published data for other University of California campuses.

NOTE: It should not be assumed that these percentages reflect the current level of faculty with terminal degrees at any institution.

Size. Based on the headcount enrollments (1974-75) of Central Washington State College (6,946), Eastern Washington State College (6,390), Western Washington State College (8,601), and The Evergreen State College (2,507), parameters employed were a minimum headcount of 3,000 and a maximum of 15,000. This resulted in an initial list of 215 institutions.

Complexity and scope of programs. The advisory committee suggested that institutions should grant masters degrees in at least nine of the 21 effective major areas of study. This parameter was modified by the staff to include institutions granting degrees in eight major areas. This was done to ensure comparability of breadth with Washington's three older state colleges (Central Washington State College, 11; Eastern Washington State College, 10; and Western Washington State College, 9).

Based on this criteria, 138 institutions were eliminated from further consideration, leaving a potential sample of 77. Examples of some institutions eliminated were Jacksonville State University (masters in 6 major areas), University of South Alabama (2), Southern Colorado State College (1), Boise State College (2), Indiana University at South Bend (2), Boston State College (1), Northern Michigan University (6), Bemidji State College (5), Northeast Missouri State University (3), SUNY at Brockport (7), SUNY at Fredonia (7), Northeastern Oklahoma State University (1), Weber State College (0), and University of Wisconsin at Stout (4).

Quality. Central Washington State College reported 61.6 percent of their faculty held terminal degrees in the year used for comparison (1973-74); Eastern Washington State College, 65.0 percent, Western Washington State College, 70.0 percent; and The Evergreen State College, 80.7 percent. Institutions were excluded from further consideration if less than 50 percent of their faculty held terminal degrees according to the data source used. This eliminated 44 institutions, leaving a list of 33. Some of the

institutions that were eliminated by this criteria were Indiana State University (46.3%); Fort Hays Kansas State College (40.0%); Northwestern State University of Louisiana (44.8%); St. Cloud State College (46%); SUNY at Potsdam (47.0%); Rhode Island College (45.0%); Eastern Kentucky University (42.0%) and Southwest Texas University (48.0%).

Economic factors. Murray State University (Kentucky), Appalachian State University (North Carolina), Western Carolina University (North Carolina); Marshall University (West Virginia), Georgia College (Georgia) and East Carolina University (North Carolina) were excluded on the basis of the substantially different economic factors of those states. Table 3 is a listing of the 27 institutions remaining in this survey category.

Community Colleges

Size. Enrollment parameters were not initially employed to eliminate any community colleges, but rather to calculate the comprehensiveness of the institutions. It was suggested that full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollments were a more appropriate measure in the community colleges, and enrollment data were collected and reviewed accordingly.

A list of 279 institutions from 38 states were found to meet the criteria of comprehensive (minimum 30 percent FTE enrollment in both academic and vocational programs), locally oriented, free standing institutions.

Community college representatives on the committee suggested that institutions in multi-campus districts meeting the criteria of comprehensiveness should be consolidated and surveyed as one element in the sample. They pointed out that, in Washington multi-campus districts, salary schedules and increments are normally effective for all campuses in a district. Also, data would be available for all campuses through the district offices.

Enrollment parameters for community colleges were subsequently discussed with the advisory committee. Institutions with less than 500 FTE

TABLE 3

COMPREHENSIVE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
SURVEY INSTITUTIONS

	1974-75 HEADCOUNT	1973-74 MASTERS DEGREES BY NUMBER OF MAJOR AREAS	PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY WITH TERMINAL DEGREES*
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY (CHICO)	13,347	13	60.0%
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY (HAYWARD)	13,668	10	77.0%
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY (HUMBOLDT)	7,592	9	52.4%
CALIFORNIA POLY STATE UNIVERSITY (SAN LUIS OBISPO)	14,657	10	79.0%
FLORIDA TECHNOLOGICAL INSTITUTE	8,893	10	66.8%
UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA	4,944	10	72.1%
EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY	8,683	12	52.3%
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY (EDWARDSVILLE)	12,608	11	75.0%
BRIDGEWATER STATE COLLEGE (MASSACHUSETTS)	7,453	11	50.0%
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY (MICHIGAN)	10,216	8	71.8%
MANKATO STATE COLLEGE (MINNESOTA)	12,743	13	50.0%
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA (OMAHA)	14,125	8	51.0%
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA (LAS VEGAS)	6,676	10	62.0%
SUNY (CORTLAND)	6,117	9	50.0%
SUNY (GENESEO)	6,567	9	64.8%
SUNY (NEW PALTZ)	8,498	10	55.0%
SUNY (OSWEGO)	9,143	8	51.0%
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY (OHIO)	13,917	11	52.7%
CENTRAL STATE UNIVERSITY (OKLAHOMA)	11,980	10	70.0%
STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY (TEXAS)	10,881	12	54.0%
TEXAS A & I UNIVERSITY	6,796	12	63.0%
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS (EL PASO)	11,418	11	60.0%
WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY	6,645	10	50.0%
MADISON COLLEGE (VIRGINIA)	7,116	8	54.0%
RADFORD COLLEGE (VIRGINIA)	4,442	9	50.0%
OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY (VIRGINIA)	13,197	8	58.0%
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN (OSHKOSH)	10,666	9	50.4%
CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE	6,964	11	61.6%
EASTERN WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE	6,390	10	65.0%
WESTERN WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE	8,601	9	70.0%
THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE	2,507		80.7%

*Data based on American Universities and Colleges, American Council on Education, Eleventh Edition (1970-71 data) or Barron's Profiles of American Colleges, 1974 Edition (1973-74 data) whichever was greater.

NOTE: It should not be assumed that these percentages reflect the current level of faculty with terminal degrees at any institution.

enrollment were eliminated as were institutions (or districts) with total FTE enrollment of 11,000 or greater.

Quality. The Council staff sought the assistance of the advisory committee in the identification of qualitative criteria for the community college sector. Committee members agreed that no established criteria existed which afforded nationally published data sufficient for the needs of this project.

Economic factors. As with the university and comprehensive college groups, institutions from the twelve states with the lowest economic factors were deleted. This deletion and the consolidation of institutions in multi-campus districts resulted in a final listing of 190 institutions or districts.

Table 4 indicates, by state and FTE enrollment, the number of comprehensive community colleges in this survey category.

TABLE 4

COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGES WITH
FTE ENROLLMENTS OF 500 TO 11,000 COMPUTED BY DISTRICT FTE TOTALS
FOR MULTI-CAMPUS DISTRICTS

	500 to 999	1000 to 1999	2000 to 2999	3000 to 3999	4000 to 4999	5000 to 5999	6000 to 6999	7000 to 7999	8000 to 8999	9000 to 9999	10,000 to 10,999	TOTAL
ARIZONA		1	1					1				3
CALIFORNIA	4	5	1	4	4	6	3	4	2*	1	5*	39
COLORADO	1	2	1	1								5
FLORIDA	1	1	2		1	1						6
IDAHO		1										1
ILLINOIS	6	11*	2	3*	1	1	1			1	1*	27
INDIANA			1									1
IOWA	1	4*	2									7
KANSAS	2											2
MAINE	1											1
MARYLAND	2	3	1	1		1						8
MASSACHUSETTS		2	5	1								8
MICHIGAN	7	3	5	1	3		2					21
MINNESOTA		4	1									5
MISSOURI	5							1*				6
MONTANA	1											1
NEBRASKA	1											1
NEW JERSEY		1		1	1	1						4
NORTH DAKOTA		1										1
OHIO			1		1							2
OKLAHOMA	1	1	1									3
OREGON	3	2	1			2				1		9
PENNSYLVANIA	1	1	1		1		1				1*	6
RHODE ISLAND					1							1
TEXAS	3	5	4	1				1*		1*		15
VIRGINIA	3	1										4
WYOMING	1	1										2
	45	50	30	13	13	12	7	7	2	4	7	190
PERCENT	23.7	26.3	15.8	6.8	6.8	6.3	3.7	3.7	1.1	2.1	3.7	100%
WASHINGTON	3	3	5	4	4	1	1	1				22
PERCENT	13.7	13.7	22.7	18.2	18.2	4.5	4.5	4.5				100%

TABLE 4
(Continued)

*Include district totals:

California

1 district (8,944 FTE) of 2 campuses
2 districts (10,321 and 10,652 FTE) of 2 campuses

Illinois

1 district (1,539 FTE) of 2 campuses
1 district (3,402 FTE) of 2 campuses
1 district (10,470 FTE) of 3 campuses

Iowa

1 district (1,165 FTE) of 2 campuses

Michigan

1 district (4,741 FTE) of 2 campuses

Missouri

1 district (7,512 FTE) of 3 campuses

Pennsylvania

1 district (10,310 FTE) of 3 campuses

Texa

1 district (7,053 FTE) of 2 campuses
1 district (9,772 FTE) of 2 campuses

Survey Process

In early October, letters were directed to the presidents of all four-year institutions from the Office of State College and University Presidents and to all two-year institutions from the State Board for Community College Education. These letters requested the participation of the survey institutions and included a postcard to be returned to the Council staff indicating their response. Copies of the letters are contained in Appendix B.

Upon receipt of the cards, letters were sent to all survey respondents outlining the details of the actual data request. Institutions were requested to provide a copy of parts 3 and 4 of their 1976-77 HEGIS report "Employees in Institutions of Higher Education". This survey has been agreed to by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the American Association of University Professors. A copy of the form is contained in Appendix C. This simplified request for a copy of available data insured the maximum possible response in order to attempt to meet the requirements set forth in the resolution.

During the last week of October, follow-up letters were sent to all nonresponding two-year institutions offering additional information about the survey and again requesting their participation. Simultaneously, telephone calls were made to nonresponding four-year institutions to ascertain the status of the requests. In certain instances, institutions indicated district or system offices that would be better able to provide the requested data.

Several institutions indicated that their data would not be available by the requested November 5 deadline, either because the 1976-77 salaries and fringe benefits were still under negotiation, or because the HEGIS

reports would not be completed until November or January. Follow-up correspondence or telephone calls were made in each instance.

Of the 190 two-year institutions or districts contacted, 131 (68.9%) indicated a willingness to participate and 13 (6.8%) stated they would be unable to do so, for a total response of 75.8 percent.

Research and Doctoral Granting Universities

Table 5 on page 24 is a complete listing of the responses from the institutions in this category. Data for the three campuses of University of California display the 1975-76 number of faculty in each rank with the appropriate 1976-77 salary increases received. In the absence of current rank mix data, University of California System-wide Administration personnel indicated that .5 percent should be included for the estimated change in mix.

Relative to the prevailing salaries and fringe benefits of the survey institutions, Washington universities rank 18th (University of Washington) and 27th (Washington State University) on a composite all ranks average. At the University of Washington, average salaries of the individual faculty ranks fell below the composite average for associate professors (23rd) assistant professors (24th) and instructors (21st). The average fringe benefits as a percentage of salaries at the survey institutions was 15.9 percent - 2.3 percent higher than at the University of Washington.

In the case of the University of Washington the parity average (average salary of the survey institutions weighted by the University of Washington rank mix) of the survey institutions was $21,134. The University of Washington was 4.6 percent below that figure.

Although the Washington State University composite ranking was 27th, salaries of associate professors ranked 29th, assistant professors 20th,

TABLE 5

RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL GRANTING UNIVERSITIES
AVERAGE SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS OF 9-10 MONTH INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY
1976-77
(Ranked by Average Salary)

	Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Instructors					
	Average Salary	Rank	Average Salary	Rank	Average Salary	Rank	Average Salary	Rank	Average Salary	Rank	Percent Fringe Benefits	Average Compensation
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA--BERKELEY*	$29,102	4	$19,516	10	$16,280	3	$10,939	26	$24,176	1	19.8	$28,963
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN--ANN ARBOR	$27,609	7	$19,786	7	$16,301	7	$12,501	15	$23,088	2	18.9	$27,428
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA--LOS ANGELES*	$28,009	5	$19,412	11	$16,210	4	$18,724	1	$23,056	3	19.9	$27,690
UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK--BUFFALO	$30,322	2	$20,750	3	$15,349	18	$ 9,752	28	$22,752	4	21.7	$27,585
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	$32,186	1	$22,483	1	$16,053	6	$12,143	19	$22,392	5	19.0	$26,650
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS--URBANA	$27,526	8	$18,898	17	$15,710	12	$11,378	23	$22,133	6	14.0	$25,237
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA	$29,817	3	$21,390	2	$15,659	13	$11,117	24	$22,080	7	12.6	$24,867
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS--AMHERST	$27,321	10	$20,145	6	$15,488	15	$13,416	3	$21,892	8	3.1	$22,570
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN--MADISON	$25,437	17	$18,054	24	$15,921	8	$12,390	16	$21,746	9	19.6	$26,011
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY	$27,677	6	$20,425	5	$16,867	1	$13,026	8	$21,666	10	15.1	$24,912
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA	$25,878	16	$19,335	12	$15,827	11	$12,180	18	$21,128	11	12.6	$23,784
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS--AUSTIN	$27,104	11	$19,633	8	$16,090	5	$12,590	14	$20,950	12	11.1	$23,282
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA--DAVIS*	$26,243	14	$19,576	9	$15,920	9	$11,084	25	$20,928	13	20.2	$25,150
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA--TWIN CITIES	$26,319	13	$18,945	19	$15,084	22	$12,629	13	$20,771	14	20.9	$25,109
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	$24,999	20	$18,543	14	$15,375	16	$14,517	2	$20,631	15	18.5	$24,456
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON	$25,213	19	$18,977	18	$15,493	14	$13,271	5	$20,417	16	14.9	$23,469
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO	$24,303	22	$18,727	20	$15,238	19	$12,630	12	$20,396	17	11.5	$22,750
INDIANA UNIVERSITY--BLOOMINGTON	$24,821	21	$18,405	15	$15,040	23	$13,248	6	$20,178	18	20.6	$24,327
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT--STORRS	$26,232	15	$18,489	21	$14,491	29	$12,304	17	$20,045	20	19.9	$24,035
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS	$24,293	23	$18,329	22	$15,093	21	$11,594	20	$19,827	21	11.9	$22,194
PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV--UNIVERSITY PARK	$27,473	9	$20,695	4	$16,509	2	$13,110	7	$19,630	22	18.9	$23,336
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY	$23,759	25	$18,741	16	$15,899	10	$12,990	9	$19,344	23	12.4	$21,745
PURDUE UNIVERSITY	$26,562	12	$19,195	13	$15,366	17	$10,898	27	$19,190	24	19.3	$22,895
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY	$23,502	26	$17,474	28	$14,619	27	$12,727	11	$18,953	25	13.9	$21,589
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI--COLUMBIA	$23,263	28	$17,597	27	$14,754	25	$13,288	4	$18,803	26	14.7	$21,566
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA--GAINSVILLE	$23,920	24	$17,033	30	$14,367	30	$11,415	22	$18,528	28	14.6	$21,228
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA--LINCOLN	$22,733	30	$17,702	26	$14,678	26	$ 9,621	29	$18,053	29	10.1	$19,872
UNIVERSITY OF OKALHOMA--NORMAN	$22,940	29	$17,960	25	$14,498	28	$ 8,946	30	$17,670	30	11.5	$19,697
AVERAGE SALARY	$26,486		$19,168		$15,570		$12,162		$20,491		15.9	$24,337
PERCENT FACULTY IN RANK	41.5%		28.3%		28.4%		3.8%		100.0%			
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON	$25,355	18	$18,265	23	$14,915	24	$11,561	21	$20,206	18	13.6	$22,954
PERCENT FACULTY IN RANK	41.0%		31.9%		25.4%		1.7%		100.0%			
PERCENT DIFFERENCE IN PARITY**									(4.5%)			
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY	$23,341	27	$17,465	29	$15,150	20	$12,885	10	$18,534	27	15.7	$21,434
PERCENT FACULTY IN RANK	33.4%		30.6%		33.4%		2.6%		100.0%			
PERCENT DIFFERENCE IN PARITY**									(9.1%)			

*1975-76 faculty increased by 1975-77 salary. No other data available.
**Parity average of University of Washington is $21,134; parity average of Washington State University if $20,226.

and instructors 10th. Average fringe benefits were 15.7 percent, closely approximating the average of the survey institutions (-.2 percent).

In the case of Washington State University, the parity average of the survey institutions was $20,226 or Washington State's average was 9.1 percent below that amount.

Comprehensive Colleges and Universities

Table 6 on page 26 lists the responses from the institutions surveyed in this category. Two institutions have just recently settled salary negotiations. The salary increase at Eastern Illinois University was 4.5 percent, and this was applied to the 1975-76 faculty in each rank as outlined by the institution. The salary settlement at Oakland University provided an elaborate process for establishing individual salaries, thus no single accurate percentage figure was available. The Michigan Board of Education suggested that five percent applied to each rank of 1975-76 faculty would be a conservative estimate.

The "parity" comparisons (in which the average salaries of each rank in the comparison group is multiplied by the number of faculty in each rank at the Washington school) are as follows: Central, 2.3 percent below an average of $18,822; Eastern, 8.0 percent below an average of $18,810; and Western, 11.3 percent below a parity average of $19,080. Since Evergreen does not use faculty ranks, there are two approaches which can be used. Using the four-rank average of the survey schools produces an average of $17,932. Evergreen's actual average of $18,737 is 4.5 percent higher. If the distribution of faculty at the three older colleges is used, the comparison figure is $18,943. On this basis, Evergreen would be 1.1 percent below that average.

TABLE 6

COMPREHENSIVE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
AVERAGE SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS OF 9-10 MONTH INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY
1976-77
(Ranked by Average Salary)

	Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Instructors					
	Average Salary	Rank	Average Salary	Rank	Average Salary	Rank	Average Salary	Rank	Average Salary	Rank	Percent Fringe Benefits	Average Compensation
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY--HAYWARD	$25,174	2	$19,183	4	$15,814	2	$13,419	7	$20,861	1	20.0	$25,040
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY--CHICO	$24,593	5	$19,081	5	$15,661	6	$13,166	9	$20,140	2	20.2	$24,211
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY--HUMBOLDT	$24,764	3	$18,890	9	$15,679	3	$13,905	3	$19,943	3	20.2	$23,968
CALIFORNIA POLY STATE UNIVERSITY--SAN LUIS OBISPO	$24,612	4	$18,970	7	$15,636	8	$13,608	4	$19,610	4	20.4	$23,619
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY--OHIO	$24,432	6	$20,329	1	$16,773	1	$13,419	7	$19,180	5	18.8	$22,779
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY--MICHIGAN[1]	$25,420	1	$19,014	6	$15,534	11	$13,925	2	$18,929	6	23.1	$23,302
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA--LAS VEGAS	$23,343	10	$19,184	2	$15,586	9	$15,385	1	$18,674	8	11.4	$20,807
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK--NEW PALTZ	$22,380	14	$17,797	16	$14,770	17	$11,422	25	$18,421	9	22.5	$22,565
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK--GENESEO	$24,315	7	$19,179	3	$13,854	28	$11,880	18	$18,004	11	22.5	$22,093
BRIDGEWATER STATE COLLEGE	$24,156	8	$18,952	8	$15,241	13	$11,483	24	$17,960	12	3.5	$18,580
TEXAS A & I UNIVERSITY	$22,563	13	$18,369	12	$15,656	7	$12,428	14	$17,808	13	10.3	$19,640
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK--OSWEGO	$23,119	9	$17,880	15	$13,708	30	$11,031	28	$17,800	14	22.7	$21,833
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN--OSHKOSH	$21,730	17	$18,139	14	$15,568	10	$13,530	6	$17,683	15	21.3	$21,456
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK--CORTLAND	$23,168	11	$17,726	17	$14,254	21	$10,638	29	$17,656	16	22.7	$21,656
MANKATO STATE UNIVERSITY--MINNESOTA	$20,900	24	$17,670	20	$15,460	12	$12,941	11	$17,441	18	15.8	$20,188
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY--EDWARDSVILLE	$21,539	20	$17,266	24	$14,539	19	$11,778	20	$17,303	19	14.8	$19,867
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS--EL PASO	$21,316	22	$17,686	19	$14,251	22	$11,587	22	$17,136	21	11.2	$19,047
EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY[2]	$21,457	21	$17,485	22	$14,002	27	$10,561	30	$17,038	22	14.1	$19,445
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA--OMAHA	$21,566	19	$17,309	23	$14,408	20	$13,009	10	$16,833	23	12.8	$18,993
STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY--TEXAS	$21,619	18	$18,637	10	$15,663	5	$12,106	16	$16,821	24	11.8	$18,811
WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY	$21,745	16	$18,511	11	$15,224	15	$12,591	12	$16,795	25	12.1	$18,833
UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA	$21,022	23	$17,214	25	$14,207	23	$11,130	26	$16,795	26	15.5	$19,403
OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY--VIRGINIA	$22,731	12	$18,267	13	$13,480	29	$11,791	19	$16,332	27	9.4	$17,860
FLORIDA TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY--ORLANDO	$20,877	25	$17,115	26	$14,795	16	$12,376	15	$16,265	28	15.1	$18,721
CENTRAL STATE UNIVERSITY--OKLAHOMA	$19,263	30	$17,696	18	$15,241	13	$12,510	13	$16,236	29	10.8	$17,994
MADISON COLLEGE--VIRGINIA	$20,549	26	$16,991	28	$14,202	24	$11,923	17	$15,763	30	9.7	$17,293
RADFORD COLLEGE--GEORGIA	$19,860	29	$16,880	29	$14,147	26	$11,497	23	$15,474	31	8.8	$16,830
AVERAGE SALARY	$22,903		$18,313		$14,920		$12,347		$17,930		16.6	$20,902
PERCENT OF FACULTY IN RANK	27.2%		30.9%		33.6%		8.3%		100.0%			
CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE	$21,779	15	$17,596	21	$15,664	4	$13,598	5	$18,396	10	12.7	$20,738
PERCENT FACULTY IN RANK	33.8%		38.0%		24.7%		3.5%		100.0%			
PERCENT DIFFERENCE IN PARITY[3]									(2.3%)			
EASTERN WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE	$20,480	27	$17,067	27	$14,560	18	$11,040	27	$17,511	17	14.4	$20,025
PERCENT FACULTY IN RANK	33.5%		38.9%		27.3%		.3%		100.0%			
PERCENT DIFFERENCE IN PARITY[3]									(8.0%)			
THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE									$18,737	7	15.4	$21,622
PERCENT DIFFERENCE IN PARITY AT FOUR RANK AVERAGE OF SURVEY INSTITUTIONS[3]									4.5%			
PERCENT DIFFERENCE IN PARITY AT RANK DISTRIBUTION OF CWSC, EWSC AND WWSC[3]									(1.1%)			
WESTERN WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE	$20,118	28	$16,471	30	$14,150	25	$11,600	21	$17,140	20	17.3	$20,109
PERCENT FACULTY IN RANK	29.0%		54.5%		16.2%		.3%		100.0%			
PERCENT DIFFERENCE IN PARITY[3]									(11.3%)			

[1]Based on estimated 5.0 percent salary increase as advised by Michigan Board of Education. Fringe benefits same as 1975-76 percentage.

[2]Based on estimated 4.5 percent increase as advised by institution.

[3]Parity average of CWSC = $18,822; parity average of EWSC = $18,910; parity average of WWSC = $19,030. At The Evergreen State College, parity was calculated two ways: using the four rank average of the survey institutions resulted in a parity of $17,932, and using the distribution of faculty at Washington's three older state colleges resulted in a parity of $18,943.

Community Colleges

Table 7 on pages 28, 29 and 30 contains the responses received from all two-year institutions. The same responses are shown by state averages (Table 8) and by FTE enrollments (Table 9) on the subsequent pages. Several institutions indicated salary negotiations were in progress. 1976 HEGIS forms were provided, however, and no adjustments were made to those reports.

The average salaries at Washington community colleges ranged from $18,384 (Tacoma Community College) to $12,986 (Whatcom Community College). The state average of all 27 colleges was $16,006 - 8.1 percent below the average of the survey institutions.

The average fringe benefits of the survey institutions was 14.7 percent. Reported figures on fringe benefits tend to understate the total fringe benefits in some states because of state-wide pooling. Where possible, institutions were contacted and corrections made to more accurately reflect the total fringe benefits.

Fringe benefits at Washington community colleges ranged from 17.0 percent (Lower Columbia College) to 11.1 percent (Tacoma Community College). Average fringe benefits of all Washington community colleges was 14.2 percent, .5 percent below the average of the survey institutions.

TABLE 7

AVERAGE SALARY AND COMPENSATION
OF 9-10 MONTH INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AT
COMMUNITY COLLEGES
(Ranked By Average Salary)

Institution	State	Number of Faculty	Average Salary	Percent of Fringe Benefits	Average Compensation
West Hills Community College	CA	49	$23,614	12.3%	$26,528
Mt. San Antonio College	CA	281	$22,049	11.6%	$24,606
West Valley College	CA	209	$21,976	13.8%	$24,998
Saddleback Community College	CA	100	$21,834	13.1%	$24,681
Chaffey College	CA	150	$21,627	12.2%	$24,262
Santa Barbara Community College	CA	154	$21,599	11.9%	$24,177
Prairie State College	IL	92	$21,472	11.3%	$23,896
Washtenaw Community College	MI	116	$21,394	16.3%	$24,802
San Jose City College	CA	144	$21,224	14.9%	$24,388
Chabot College	CA	258	$21,054	15.1%	$24,241
Chicago City College District	IL	536	$21,054	17.8%	$24,812
Riverside City College	CA	183	$20,923	15.9%	$24,242
Palomar Community College	CA	177	$20,812	12.4%	$23,390
Barstow Community College	CA	35	$20,744	13.4%	$23,516
State Center Community College District	CA	304	$20,742	11.6%	$23,142
Porterville College	CA	58	$20,649	11.0%	$22,926
Santa Rosa Junior College	CA	185	$20,607	12.5%	$23,184
Southwestern College	CA	173	$20,554	14.1%	$23,457
Montgomery Community College--Tahoma	MD	91	$20,478	14.0%	$23,336
Henry Ford Community College	MI	169	$20,137	22.4%	$24,643
Shasta College*	CA	129	$20,062	12.3%	$22,539
Yuba Community College	CA	102	$20,041	12.4%	$22,438
Victor Valley College	CA	52	$20,011	13.0%	$22,622
Grossmont College	CA	231	$19,987	13.1%	$22,605
Yosemite Junior College District*	CA	220	$19,879	13.3%	$22,533
Dallas County Community College District	TX	312	$19,639	6.7%	$20,946
Cabrillo College	CA	168	$19,577	13.7%	$22,262
Gavilan College	CA	45	$19,570	11.3%	$21,779
College of the Siskiyous	CA	49	$19,319	11.0%	$21,444
Prince George's Community College	MD	223	$19,166	7.5%	$20,691
Wayne County Community College	MI	176	$18,952	17.4%	$22,255
Triton College	IL	210	$18,783	11.1%	$20,877
Schoolcraft College	MI	141	$18,573	22.9%	$22,831
Delta College	MI	186	$18,572	19.4%	$22,175
Solano Community College*	CA	133	$18,524	12.5%	$20,832
Tacoma Community College	WA	82	$18,384	11.1%	$20,418
Antelope Valley Community College	CA	68	$18,307	14.9%	$21,041
William Rainey Harper College	IL	176	$18,253	15.6%	$21,097
Metropolitan Community College District	MO	227	$18,232	12.7%	$20,545
Grays Harbor College	WA	41	$18,139	12.6%	$20,433
Cuyahoga Comm College--Western Campus	OH	137	$18,082	18.0%	$21,337
Muskegon Community College	MI	113	$17,383	20.7%	$21,590
St. Clair County Community College	MI	86	$17,565	19.1%	$20,913
Bergen Community College	NJ	212	$17,561	22.0%	$21,430
Alpena Community College	MI	53	$17,517	20.0%	$21,020
Green River Community College	WA	108	$17,450	14.3%	$19,938
Monroe County Community College	MI	44	$17,437	23.1%	$21,460
Bellevue Community College	WA	85	$17,333	14.9%	$19,916
Yakima Valley Community College	WA	105	$17,304	12.9%	$19,534
Community College of Philadelphia	PA	267	$17,292	20.8%	$20,886
Maricopa Technical Community College	AZ	62	$17,289	14.5%	$19,798
Elgin Community College	IL	88	$17,034	14.5%	$19,497
Illinois Valley Community College	IL	81	$17,022	14.0%	$19,402
Blue Mountain Community College	OR	64	$16,988	22.1%	$20,748
Rochester Community College	MN	87	$16,976	16.3%	$19,739
Belleville Area College*	IL	133	$16,944	11.0%	$18,800
Butler County Community College	PA	39	$16,895	13.2%	$19,132
Big Bend Community College	WA	45	$16,769	13.9%	$19,095
Anoka-Ramsey Community College	MN	72	$16,550	16.5%	$19,405
Catonsville Community College	MD	204	$16,647	11.4%	$18,543

TABLE 7
(Continued)

AVERAGE SALARY AND COMPENSATION
OF 9-10 MONTH INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AT
COMMUNITY COLLEGES
(Ranked By Average Salary)

Institution	State	Number of Faculty	Average Salary	Percent of Fringe Benefits	Average Compensation
North Hennepin Community College	MN	73	$16,589	16.5%	$19,324
Portland Community College	OR	267	$16,558	17.8%	$19,509
Rock Valley College	IL	119	$16,526	16.5%	$19,249
Black Hawk College	IL	146	$16,488	15.9%	$19,112
Metropolitan Community College	MN	51	$16,458	16.5%	$19,169
Columbia Basin Community College	WA	88	$16,447	12.5%	$18,506
Illinois Central College	IL	194	$16,434	14.8%	$18,862
North Iowa Area Community College	IA	71	$16,426	14.5%	$18,800
Seattle Community College District	WA	329	$16,375	15.1%	$18,839
Clark College	WA	89	$16,259	12.4%	$18,272
Brookdale Community College*	NJ	76	$16,188	16.3%	$18,810
Lane Community College	OR	202	$16,180	**13.0%**	**$18,285**
Highline Community College	WA	141	$16,146	13.5%	$18,320
Harrisburg Area Community College	PA	111	$16,133	17.4%	$18,941
Mt. Hood Community College	OR	148	$16,121	17.8%	$18,993
Bucks County Community College	PA	188	$16,105	15.9%	$18,668
Gloucester County College	NJ	76	$16,036	21.4%	$19,465
Peninsula Community College	WA	39	$15,965	15.8%	$18,485
Lorain County Community College	OH	100	$15,898	19.5%	$19,005
Community College of Allegheny County	PA	291	$15,894	16.4%	$18,505
Umpqua Community College	OR	52	$15,807	17.7%	$18,610
Moraine Valley Community College	IL	146	$15,757	12.0%	$17,655
Lansing Community College	MI	34	$15,705	22.7%	$19,276
Bay de Noc Community College	MI	44	$15,667	21.2%	$18,990
Lower Columbia College	WA	63	$15,639	17.0%	$18,294
Lehigh County Community College	PA	63	$15,605	18.2%	$18,444
Skagit Valley College	WA	65	$15,600	14.3%	$17,827
Ellsworth Community College	IA	33	$15,530	16.6%	$18,115
Fort Steilacoom Community College	WA	82	$15,487	14.3%	$17,701
Wenatchee Valley College	WA	51	$15,458	14.5%	$17,704
Rhode Island Junior College	RI	269	$15,414	17.3%	$18,083
Manatee Junior College	FL	76	$15,400	17.7%	$18,120
Highland Community College	IL	17	$15,391	9.6%	$16,864
Everett/Edmonds Community College District	WA	179	$15,365	14.4%	$17,582
Flathead Valley Community College	MT	28	$15,308	7.9%	$16,522
Howard Community College	MD	31	$15,281	12.1%	$17,131
Brevard Community College	FL	199	$15,247	18.8%	$18,115
Inver Hills Community College	MN	50	$15,236	17.2%	$17,852
Lake City Community College	FL	41	$15,216	15.2%	$17,528
Spokane Community College District*	WA	306	$15,190	13.8%	$17,290
Polk Community College	FL	49	$15,163	20.4%	$18,255
Olympic Community College*	WA	95	$15,162	14.3%	$17,333
Cape Cod Community College	MA	87	$15,161	7.3%	$16,265
Linn-Benton Community College	OR	98	$15,151	18.3%	$17,922
Shoreline Community College	WA	142	$15,139	15.7%	$17,513
Southeastern Community College	IA	68	$15,029	13.0%	$16,978
Centralia/Olympia Tech Comm Col Dist.*	WA	80	$14,975	14.9%	$17,205
John A. Logan College*	IL	47	$14,954	11.2%	$16,631
Palm Beach Junior College	FL	183	$14,932	14.1%	$17,044
Wharton County Junior College	TX	77	$14,751	14.7%	$16,916
Sauk Valley College	IL	56	$14,742	14.5%	$16,886
Kishwaukee College	IL	35	$14,693	14.1%	$16,762
Tarrant County District	TX	275	$14,655	13.8%	$16,674
Pima Community College	AZ	223	$14,654	16.4%	$17,063
Hagerstown Junior College	MD	51	$14,430	14.9%	$16,581
Brazosport College	TX	65	$14,415	8.8%	$15,677
Florida Keys Community College	FL	33	$14,382	19.2%	$17,141
Lake Land College	IL	94	$14,356	14.3%	$16,406
Gogebic Community College	MI	27	$14,342	20.7%	$17,310
Cochise College	AZ	50	$14,297	16.5%	$16,654

TABLE 7
(Continued)

AVERAGE SALARY AND COMPENSATION
OF 9-10 MONTH INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AT
COMMUNITY COLLEGES
(Ranked By Average Salary)

Institution	State	Number of Faculty	Average Salary	Percent of Fringe Benefits	Average Compensation
Aims Community College	CO	79	$14,135	20.2%	$16,994
Des Moines Area Community College	IA	80	$14,083	14.2%	$16,080
Arapahoe Community College	CO	90	$14,050	15.9%	$16,280
Quinsigamond Community College	MA	100	$14,018	4.9%	$14,707
Bismarck Junior College	ND	57	$14,012	15.1%	$16,129
Trinidad State Junior College	CO	47	$13,964	14.1%	$15,932
Otero Junior College	CO	50	$13,875	14.3%	$15,853
Holyoke Community College*	MA	126	$13,803	5.5%	$14,559
Charles County Community College	MD	29	$13,802	5.9%	$14,615
Walla Walla Community College	WA	50	$13,798	14.8%	$15,837
Garden City Community College	KS	63	$13,786	16.5%	$16,067
Bee County College	TX	50	$13,635	8.4%	$14,776
Cowley County Community Junior College	KS	33	$13,478	16.1%	$15,648
El Paso Community College	CO	142	$13,409	14.1%	$15,293
Southern Maine Voc-Tech Institute	ME	63	$13,366	12.8%	$15,082
Western Texas College	TX	39	$13,325	7.4%	$14,306
Navarro College	TX	26	$13,194	8.5%	$14,314
Northern Oklahoma College	OK	49	$13,091	8.4%	$14,196
Central Technical Community College Area	NB	123	$13,052	16.4%	$15,193
Tulsa Junior College	OK	105	$13,000	10.3%	$14,336
Whatcom Community College	WA	14	$12,986	15.4%	$14,981
Kankakee Community College	IL	38	$12,955	14.3%	$14,804
State Community College	IL	74	$12,917	15.2%	$14,875
McLennan Community College	TX	38	$12,852	14.0%	$14,655
Treasure Valley Community College	OR	47	$12,849	17.9%	$15,155
Kirkwood Community College	IA	16	$12,848	11.1%	$14,276
East Central Junior College	MO	34	$12,737	12.7%	$14,388
Amarillo College	TX	117	$12,559	14.0%	$14,314
College of Southern Idaho	ID	63	$12,148	17.7%	$14,297
Iowa Western Community College	IA	99	$12,104	15.1%	$13,935
Vincennes University	IN	137	$11,725	19.0%	$13,949
Three Rivers Community College	MO	27	$11,189	10.8%	$12,392
Crowder College	MO	37	$10,266	9.3%	$11,218
		14,896	$17,413	14.7%	$19,981

*1976-77 salaries under negotiation.

TABLE 8

1976-77 AVERAGE SALARY
OF 9-10 MONTH INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES
(Ranked by State Averages)

	Faculty	Dollars	Average Salary
California	3,657	$ 75,785,845	$20,724
Michigan	1,189	$ 22,131,207	$18,613
Illinois	2,282	$ 40,513,552	$17,754
Maryland	629	$ 11,143,379	$17,716
Ohio	237	$ 4,067,067	$17,161
New Jersey	364	$ 6,171,944	$16,956
Minnesota	333	$ 5,488,396	$16,482
Pennsylvania	959	$ 15,702,534	$16,374
Oregon	878	$ 14,073,195	$16,029
Washington	2,282	$ 36,526,032	$16,006
Texas	1,049	$ 16,374,974	$15,610
Rhode Island	269	$ 4,146,377	$15,414
Montana	28	$ 428,630	$15,308
Florida	581	$ 8,778,452	$15,109
Arizona	335	$ 5,054,744	$15,089
Iowa	367	$ 5,231,284	$14,254
Massachusetts	313	$ 4,459,912	$14,249
North Dakota	57	$ 798,675	$14,012
Colorado	408	$ 5,635,325	$13,812
Kansas	96	$ 1,313,306	$13,680
Maine	63	$ 842,048	$13,366
Nebraska*	123	$ 1,605,360	$13,052
Oklahoma	154	$ 2,006,449	$13,029
Missouri	325	$ 5,253,680	$12,659
Idaho	63	$ 765,320	$12,148
Indiana	137	$ 1,606,296	$11,725
Total**	14,896	$259,377,951	$17,413

*Negotiated 200 day contract for 1976-77.
**Totals do not include Washington

Not reported: Virginia and Wyoming

TABLE 9

1976-77 AVERAGE SALARY
OF 9-10 MONTH INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES
(By FTE Enrollment Categories)*

Enrollment	Number of Institutions	Total Faculty	Salary Dollars	Average Salary
500 - 999	26	1,124	$ 16,469,516	$14,653
1,000 - 1,999	33	2,074	$ 33,138,189	$15,978
2,000 - 2,999	23	2,105	$ 32,413,586	$15,398
3,000 - 3,999	9	1,190	$ 20,338,059	$17,091
4,000 - 4,999	9	1,645	$ 28,716,989	$17,457
5,000 - 5,999	10	1,830	$ 34,296,844	$18,741
6,000 - 6,999	5	830	$ 15,382,732	$18,533
7,000 - 7,999	6	1,361	$ 25,791,978	$18,951
8,000 - 8,999	2	364	$ 7,429,676	$20,411
9,000 - 9,999	4	961	$ 16,988,447	$17,678
10,000 - 10,999	4	1,412	$ 28,411,935	$20,122
	131	14,896	$259,377,951	$17,413
Washington				
500 - 999	3	100	$ 1,680,143	$16,801
1,000 - 1,999	3	140	$ 2,100,899	$15,006
2,000 - 2,999	5	401	$ 6,461,510	$16,113
3,000 - 3,999	4	374	$ 6,041,982	$16,155
4,000 - 4,999	4	453	$ 7,455,587	$16,458
5,000 - 5,999	1	179	$ 2,750,418	$15,365
6,000 - 6,999	1	306	$ 4,648,172	$15,190
7,000 - 7,999	1	329	$ 5,387,321	$16,375
	22	2,282	$ 36,526,032	$16,006

*Based on Fall, 1974 HEGIS Opening Fall Enrollment.

Timing of the Survey

The Senate Resolution requires that the survey findings be reported by the Council by November 15 of each year. In view of the experience in conducting this survey, it was found that meeting a November 15 due date is not feasible when acquiring a full range of actual current year salary information on an other than preliminary basis.

While institutions were most cooperative and willing to assist in this project, the fact that the data were in many instances not available could not be overcome. Several months were spent in follow-up correspondence and telephone calls in order to insure the receipt of data from each institution as soon as available. Even so, estimated data are still presented for five institutions.

There are several parties interested in salary and fringe benefit information. If this process is to be continued, it needs to be understood that only preliminary information, including estimates as provided by survey institutions, will be available and then not until approximately December 1. This need not present a major barrier to use of preliminary data since the relationship of the final all ranks averages to the preliminary results are quite close. The relationships are as follows: research and doctoral granting universities -- final average .69 percent higher than preliminary average; comprehensive colleges and universities -- .07 percent lower than preliminary average; and community colleges -- 1.14 percent lower than preliminary average. These variations are not only very small, but would become more predictable in future preliminary reports with a historical data base from which to derive estimates based on institutional advice.

According to information from Department of Health, Education & Welfare, the 1977-78 salary data is due on November 1, but may be delayed until January 15 to include salary increases not available by November 1. This could have the effect of deferring final survey information until approximately the middle of March.

Summary

In total, this survey reviewed the prevailing rates of salary and fringe benefits of 186 selected institutions in 31 states involving 51,475 instructional faculty on nine-month contract.

As with any survey of selected institutions that could be developed, this one offers a set of indicators to be viewed in conjunction with other surveys and cost of living indices in order that decision-makers have as broad an information base as possible. The Council for Postsecondary Education at its January 1977 meeting based its recommendations for faculty salary increases on a restoration of constant dollar salaries. Those recommendations are contained in the report, Recommendations for Faculty Salaries in Washington Public Higher Education, March 1977. Also contained in the same report are the final results of the traditional seven state survey for 1976-77. As discussed in that report, the results of the seven state survey and the survey described in this report are within approximately three percent of each other.

It is our hope that these results will be of assistance to the legislature and the Governor in their deliberations on this important question.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Senate Resolution 1976-209

Appendix B: Letters from State Board for Community College Education and Office of State College and University Presidents

Appendix C: HEGIS Survey Employees in Institutions of Higher Education 1976-77

IN THE LEGISLATURE
of the
STATE OF WASHINGTON

SENATE RESOLUTION
1976 - 209

By Senators Sandison, Goltz, Benitz, Odegaard, Scott, Guess and Donohue

WHEREAS, It is the policy of the State of Wasnington to compensate its employees at the prevailing rate for similar work performed in other comparable jurisdictions as determined by periodic surveys; and

WHEREAS, There is a continuing need for consistent reliable salary survey information for faculty of the public universities, state colleges and community colleges to guide the legislature in determining appropriate compensation levels;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Senate, that the Council for Postsecondary Education develop appropriate salary survey procedures to separately determine prevailing wage rates for faculty of the four-year institutions of higher education, and of the state community colleges, such surveys to include information on faculty salaries and fringe benefits from appropriate public institutions in other states which are deemed to be comparable to Washington institutions in size, complexity and scope of programs and shall meet qualitative guidelines established by the Council;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the surveys shall be conducted under the direction of the Council and the survey findings are to be reported by the Council, by November 15 of each year, to the Ways and Means and Higher Education Committees of the House and Senate and to the Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the State Board for Community College Education and the public universities and colleges be requested to cooperate in the development and execution of the surveys;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted immediately upon adoption by the Secretary of the Senate to the House of Representatives, the Council for Postsecondary Education, the State Board for Community College Education, and the public universities and four-year colleges in the state.

I, Sid Snyder, Secretary of the Senate
do hereby certify that this is a true and
correct copy of Senate Resolution No. 1976-209,
adopted by the Senate March 15, 1976.

SID SNYDER
Secretary of the Senate

Office of the Council of State College & University Presidents

Robert L. Carr, Director
Olympia, Washington 98505
SCAN 727-6125 206 866-6125

October 4, 1976

Dear

In response to a resolution of the Washington State Senate, the Council of Presidents for the state colleges and universities in the state of Washington is cooperating with the Washington Council for Postsecondary Education in a survey of faculty salaries and fringe benefits at selected institutions. Your institution has been included in our survey group, and we would personally appreciate your participation.

Since the Senate Resolution requires that a report be submitted by November 15, we have attempted to make participation as easy as possible. All that will be necessary is to send a completed copy of Parts 3 and 4 of the Higher Education General Information Survey report "Employees in Institutions of Higher Education" to the Council for Postsecondary Education by November 5, 1976. We would appreciate receiving a copy of your report as well. Since the federal government has requested the report by November 1, we hope that this approach will produce the maximum possible response.

We would appreciate your returning the enclosed, pre-addressed card indicating your willingness to participate in this survey and designating a contact person at your institution. That individual will then be contacted directly by staff of the Council for Postsecondary Education. Please indicate on the card if you would like a copy of the final report.

We hope it will be possible for you to participate in this project.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Carr
Director

RLC:sms
Enclosure

APPENDIX B

STATE OF WASHINGTON

State Board for Community College Education

319 Seventh Avenue
Olympia, Washington 98504

October 8, 1976

Dear

In response to a resolution of the Washington State Senate, the State Board for Community College Education is cooperating with the Washington Council for Post-secondary Education (CPE) in a survey of faculty salaries and fringe benefits at selected institutions. Your institution has been included in our survey group and I would personally appreciate your participation.

Because we know you receive many requests for data, we have attempted to make participation as easy as possible. All that will be necessary is to provide the CPE on or before November 5, 1976, with (1) completed copies of Part 3 and Part 4 of the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) report "Employees in Institutions of Higher Education," and (2) attach a copy of your college's current salary schedule or faculty pay plan. Your HEGIS reports are due November 1 in any event, so we hope that this approach will produce the maximum possible response to our survey.

I would appreciate your immediate return of the enclosed, pre-addressed and postage-free card indicating your willingness to participate in this survey and designating a contact person at your institution. That individual will then be contacted directly by the CPE staff. Please indicate on the card if you would like a copy of the final report.

I hope it will be possible for you to participate in this project.

Sincerely yours,

John C. Mundt
Director

JCM:dp

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
EDUCATION DIVISION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

HIGHER EDUCATION GENERAL INFORMATION SURVEY (HEGIS XI)

EMPLOYEES IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION 1976–77

PLEASE READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM.

FORM APPROVED
OMB NO. 51–R1022

1. INSTITUTION CODE NUMBER

2. DUE DATE

Not later than November 1, 1976

Please supply all the identifying information requested on this page. When the survey form has been completed, please return it either directly to Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Education Division, National Center for Education Statistics, ATTN: Room 2164-HEGIS, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C. 20202, or to the HEGIS coordinator, if there is a HEGIS coordinator in your State.

3. NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS OF INSTITUTION OR CAMPUS COVERED BY THIS REPORT *(include city, State, and ZIP code)*

4. NAME AND TITLE OF RESPONDENT

5. TELEPHONE NUMBER OF RESPONDENT *(area code, local number, and extension)*

6. **PLEASE NOTE** THAT EACH INSTITUTION, BRANCH, CAMPUS OR OTHER ENTITY SEPARATELY CERTIFIED BY THE ACCREDITATION AND INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY UNIT OF THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, WITH IT'S OWN FICE CODE, AND LISTED SEPARATELY IN THE **EDUCATION DIRECTORY - HIGHER EDUCATION**, SHOULD BE REPORTED ON A SEPARATE SURVEY FORM AND NOT INCLUDED OR COMBINED WITH ANY OTHER SUCH CERTIFIED UNIT. BRANCHES, CAMPUSES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL ENTITIES NOT SEPARATELY CERTIFIED SHOULD BE INCLUDED WITH THE APPROPRIATE INSTITUTION OR BRANCH REPORT. IF SUCH ARE INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT, PLEASE LIST THEM BELOW.

ARE DATA FOR THIS UNIT INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT?	NAME OF BRANCH AND/OR OTHER CAMPUS	ADDRESS *(city, State, and ZIP code)*
☐ YES ☐ NO		
☐ YES ☐ NO		
☐ YES ☐ NO		

7. IF THE EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION OR ENTITY COVERED BY THIS SURVEY REPORT IS PART OF A MULTI-CAMPUS INSTITUTION, OR PART OF A SYSTEM OF INSTITUTIONS, PLEASE ENTER THE NAME OF THE INSTITUTION OR SYSTEM BELOW.
IF NOT APPLICABLE, CHECK HERE → ☐

DEFINITIONS

MULTI-CAMPUS INSTITUTION. An organization bearing a resemblance to an institutional system, but unequivocally designated as a single institution with either of two organizational structures: (1) an institution having two or more campuses responsible to a central administration (which central administration may or may not be located on one of the administratively equal campuses) or (2) an institution having a main campus with one or more branch campuses attached to it.

MAIN CAMPUS. In those institutions comprised of a main campus and one or more branch campuses, the main campus (sometimes called the parent institution) is usually the location of the core, primary, or most comprehensive program. Unless the institution-wide or central administrative office for such institutions is reported to be at a different location, the main campus is also the location of the central administrative office.

BRANCH CAMPUS. A campus of an institution of higher education which is organized on a relatively permanent basis (i.e., has a relatively permanent administration), which offers an organized program or programs of work of at least 2 years (as opposed to courses), and which is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located. To be considered in a community different from that of the parent institution, a branch shall be located beyond a reasonable commuting distance from the main campus of the parent institution.

INSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM. A complex of two or more institutions of higher education, each separately organized or independently complete, under the control or supervision of a single administrative body.

PART 3–SALARIES AND TENURE OF FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY, 1976-77

DEFINITIONS

Instructional Faculty. For purposes of this part of the survey, the instructional faculty is defined as those members of the Instruction/Research staff who are employed on a full-time basis and who are engaged in classroom instruction for more than one-half of their time in the 1976-77 academic year. Instructional faculty on sabbatical leave should be reported at their regular salaries even though the faculty member may be receiving a reduced annuity while on leave. Chairmen of departments should be reported if they have no other administrative title and hold a faculty rank. Do not report the salaries of (1) faculty (such as members of religious orders) whose services are valued by bookkeeping entries rather than by full cash transactions, or (2) faculty who as members of military organizations are paid on a different basis than civilian employees.

Salary Contracts. Report the salaries of faculty on either 9-month or 11/12-month bases. For purposes of this survey, the term 9-month salary applies to faculty who teach for two semesters, three quarters, two trimesters, two four-month sessions or the equivalent. Those faculty members teaching on any of these bases should be reported in the section of this part of the survey entitled 9-month salaries. Faculty who teach more than one-half of their time, and are employed for the entire year should be reported in the section of the form entitled 11/12-month salaries. These faculty members are usually employed for 11 months of teaching with one month of vacation. Faculty should be reported as having 9-month or 11/12-month salaries on the basis of the period of employment; not on the basis of the number of installments in which salaries are paid. If the conditions of employment of all of the faculty at your institution are other than those defined here, see item (1) under exclusions, below.

Tenure. Of the number of instructional faculty being reported for each rank, also report the number who have tenure in each of those ranks. If a position is tenured, but the person holding it has not yet earned the tenure privilege, the person should not be counted as having tenure. Furthermore, do not count tenured persons as having tenure if their salaries were not included in the total salary outlay for that academic rank. If none of the instructional faculty at a particular rank are tenured, please enter a zero in that space.

Exclusions. Do not report the numbers of faculty, their salaries or number tenured for any of the groups of employees listed below:

(1) Instructional faculty who are employed to teach less than two semesters, three quarters, two trimesters, or two 4-month sessions. If this statement applies to *all* faculty at your institution, please indicate at the bottom of page 8.

(2) Instructional faculty for preclinical and clinical medicine. If this statement applies to **all** faculty at your institution, please indicate at the bottom of page 8. (**Note**: Instructional faculty in all other health fields, such as dentistry, veterinary medicine, nursing, dental hygiene, etc. should be reported.)

(3) Instructional faculty who are employed on a part-time basis. If this statement applies to *all* faculty at your institution, please indicate at the bottom of page 8.

(4) Administrative officers with titles such as Dean of Instruction, Academic Dean, Dean of Faculty, Dean of Students, Librarian, Registrar, Coach, etc., even though they may devote part of their time to classroom instruction.

(5) Instructional faculty in ROTC programs in U.S. Service Schools if their salaries are determined on a different basis than the salaries of the civilian faculty.

(6) Undergraduate or graduate students who assist in the instruction of courses but have titles such as teaching assistant, teaching associate, teaching fellows, etc.

INSTRUCTIONS

In Part 3A, page 8, column 1, report the numbers of male faculty members on 9-month salaries according to their academic ranks. In column 2, report to the nearest whole dollar, the total salary outlay for those faculty members reported in column 1. Report in column 3 the number of faculty members reported in column 1 who currently have tenure privileges. In column 4, enter the numbers of faculty members who contribute their services or who are active members of military organizations; these persons should not be included in column 1 and their salaries should not be reported in column 2. On page 9, show the distribution by salary intervals of the male faculty reported in column 1 of Part 3A on page 8. The total on line 61, page 9, for each academic rank should equal the corresponding number of persons of that rank which are reported in column 1 on page 8. The salary intervals in the distribution are in $500 increments up to $30,000 and in $1,000 increments above $30,000. Similarly, report the data for female faculty members on 9-month salaries in columns 5-8 on page 8, and on page 9 show the distribution by salary intervals of the persons reported in column 5, page 8.

In Part 3B, page 8, report data for faculty on 11/12-month salaries. The persons reported in columns 1 and 5, page 8, should be distributed by salary intervals on page 10.

NAME OF INSTITUTION

1. INSTITUTION CODE NUMBER

PART 3–SALARIES, AND TENURE OF FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY, 1976-77

A. FACULTY ON 9-MONTH SALARY CONTRACTS

ACADEMIC RANK	MEN				WOMEN			
	NUMBER OF PERSONS (1)	TOTAL SALARY OUTLAY (2)	NO. IN COL. 1 WITH TENURE (3)	NO. CONTRIBUTING SERVICES OR MILITARY (4)	NUMBER OF PERSONS (5)	TOTAL SALARY OUTLAY (6)	NO. IN COL. 5 WITH TENURE (7)	NO. CONTRIBUTING SERVICES OR MILITARY (8)
1. PROFESSORS								
2. ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS								
3. ASSISTANT PROFESSORS								
4. INSTRUCTORS								
5. LECTURERS								
6. UNDESIGNATED RANK								
7. *TOTAL (sum of lines 1-6)*								

B. FACULTY ON 11/12 MONTH SALARY CONTRACTS

ACADEMIC RANK	MEN				WOMEN			
	NUMBER OF PERSONS (1)	TOTAL SALARY OUTLAY (2)	NO. IN COL. 1 WITH TENURE (3)	NO. CONTRIBUTING SERVICES OR MILITARY (4)	NUMBER OF PERSONS (5)	TOTAL SALARY OUTLAY (6)	NO. IN COL. 5 WITH TENURE (7)	NO. CONTRIBUTING SERVICES OR MILITARY (8)
8. PROFESSORS								
9. ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS								
10. ASSISTANT PROFESSORS								
11. INSTRUCTIONS								
12. LECTURERS								
13. UNDESIGNATED RANK								
14. *TOTAL (sum of lines 8-13)*								

15. IF THIS SURVEY IS NOT APPLICABLE TO YOUR INSTITUTION BECAUSE THE EXCLUSIONS CITED IN THE DEFINITIONS EMBRACE ALL OF YOUR INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY, PLEASE MARK THE APPROPRIATE ITEM BELOW AND RETURN THE FORM:

☐ (1) ALL OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AT THIS INSTITUTION ARE PAID UNDER CONTRACTS OTHER THAN 9 OR 11/12 MONTH DURATION.

52 ☐ (2) ALL INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AT THIS INSTITUTION TEACH PRECLINICAL OR CLINICAL MEDICINE.

☐ (3) ALL OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AT THIS INSTITUTION ARE EMPLOYED ON A PART-TIME BASIS.

53

NAME OF INSTITUTION | 1. INSTITUTION CODE NO.

PART 3A (cont.)—DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY ON 9-MONTH SALARIES, 1976-77

LINE NO.	Salary Intervals	MEN						WOMEN						Salary Intervals	LINE NO.
		Prof. (1)	Assoc. (2)	Asst. (3)	Instr. (4)	Lect. (5)	Undes.* (6)	Prof. (7)	Assoc. (8)	Asst. (9)	Instr. (10)	Lect. (11)	Undes.* (12)		
01.	$40,000 and over													$40,000 and over	01.
02.	39,000 to 39,999													39,000 to 39,999	02.
03.	38,000 to 38,999													38,000 to 38,999	03.
04.	37,000 to 37,999													37,000 to 37,999	04.
05.	36,000 to 36,999													36,000 to 36,999	05.
06.	35,000 to 35,999													35,000 to 35,999	06.
07.	34,000 to 34,999													34,000 to 34,999	07.
08.	33,000 to 33,999													33,000 to 33,999	08.
09.	32,000 to 32,999													32,000 to 32,999	09.
10.	31,000 to 31,999													31,000 to 31,999	10.
11.	30,000 to 30,999													30,000 to 30,999	11.
12.	29,500 to 29,999													29,500 to 29,999	12.
13.	29,000 to 29,499													29,000 to 29,499	13.
14.	28,500 to 28,999													28,500 to 28,999	14.
15.	28,000 to 28,499													28,000 to 28,499	15.
16.	27,500 to 27,999													27,500 to 27,999	16.
17.	27,000 to 27,499													27,000 to 27,499	17.
18.	26,500 to 26,999													26,500 to 26,999	18.
19.	26,000 to 26,499													26,000 to 26,499	19.
20.	25,500 to 25,999													25,500 to 25,999	20.
36.	17,500 to 17,999													17,500 to 17,999	36.
37.	17,000 to 17,499													17,000 to 17,499	37.
38.	16,500 to 16,999													16,500 to 16,999	38.
39.	16,000 to 16,499													16,000 to 16,499	39.
40.	15,500 to 15,999													15,500 to 15,999	40.
41.	15,000 to 15,499													15,000 to 15,499	41.
42.	14,500 to 14,999													14,500 to 14,999	42.
43.	14,000 to 14,499													14,000 to 14,499	43.
44.	13,500 to 13,999													13,500 to 13,999	44.
45.	13,000 to 13,499													13,000 to 13,499	45.
46.	12,500 to 12,999													12,500 to 12,999	46.
47.	12,000 to 12,499													12,000 to 12,499	47.
48.	11,500 to 11,999													11,500 to 11,999	48.
49.	11,000 to 11,499													11,000 to 11,499	49.
50.	10,500 to 10,999													10,500 to 10,999	50.
51.	10,000 to 10,499													10,000 to 10,499	51.
52.	9,500 to 9,999													9,500 to 9,999	52.
53.	9,000 to 9,499													9,000 to 9,499	53.
54.	8,500 to 8,999													8,500 to 8,999	54.
55.	8,000 to 8,499													8,000 to 8,499	55.
56.	7,500 to 7,999													7,500 to 7,999	56.
57.	7,000 to 7,499													7,000 to 7,499	57.
58.	6,500 to 6,999													6,500 to 6,999	58.
59.	6,000 to 6,499													6,000 to 6,499	59.
60.	Below $6,000													Below $6,000	60.
61.	Total													Total	61.

OE FORM 2300-3, 3/76

*Undesignated Rank

NAME OF INSTITUTION | 1. INSTITUTION CODE NO.

PART 3B (cont.)—DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY ON 11/12-MONTH SALARIES, 1976-77

LINE NO.	Salary Intervals	MEN						WOMEN						Salary Intervals	LINE NO.
		Prof. (1)	Assoc. (2)	Asst. (3)	Instr. (4)	Lect. (5)	Undes.* (6)	Prof. (7)	Assoc. (8)	Asst. (9)	Instr. (10)	Lect. (11)	Undes.* (12)		
01.	$40,000 and over													$40,000 and over	01.
02.	39,000 to 39,999													39,000 to 39,999	02.
03.	38,000 to 38,999													38,000 to 38,999	03.
04.	37,000 to 37,999													37,000 to 37,999	04.
05.	36,000 to 36,999													36,000 to 36,999	05.
06.	35,000 to 35,999													35,000 to 35,999	06.
07.	34,000 to 34,999													34,000 to 34,999	07.
08.	33,000 to 33,999													33,000 to 33,999	08.
09.	32,000 to 32,999													32,000 to 32,999	09.
10.	31,000 to 31,999													31,000 to 31,999	10.
11.	30,000 to 30,999													30,000 to 30,999	11.
12.	29,500 to 29,999													29,500 to 29,999	12.
13.	29,000 to 29,499													29,000 to 29,499	13.
14.	28,500 to 28,999													28,500 to 28,999	14.
15.	28,000 to 28,499													28,000 to 28,499	15.
16.	27,500 to 27,999													27,500 to 27,999	16.
17.	27,000 to 27,499													27,000 to 27,499	17.
18.	26,500 to 26,999													26,500 to 26,999	18.
19.	26,000 to 26,499													26,000 to 26,499	19.
20.	25,500 to 25,999													25,500 to 25,999	20.
36.	17,500 to 17,999													17,500 to 17,999	36.
37.	17,000 to 17,499													17,000 to 17,499	37.
38.	16,500 to 16,999													16,500 to 16,999	38.
39.	16,000 to 16,499													16,000 to 16,499	39.
40.	15,500 to 15,999													15,500 to 15,999	40.
41.	15,000 to 15,499													15,000 to 15,499	41.
42.	14,500 to 14,999													14,500 to 14,999	42.
43.	14,000 to 14,499													14,000 to 14,499	43.
44.	13,500 to 13,999													13,500 to 13,999	44.
45.	13,000 to 13,499													13,000 to 13,499	45.
46.	12,500 to 12,999													12,500 to 12,999	46.
47.	12,000 to 12,499													12,000 to 12,499	47.
48.	11,500 to 11,999													11,500 to 11,999	48.
49.	11,000 to 11,499													11,000 to 11,499	49.
50.	10,500 to 10,999													10,500 to 10,999	50.
51.	10,000 to 10,499													10,000 to 10,499	51.
52.	9,500 to 9,999													9,500 to 9,999	52.
53.	9,000 to 9,499													9,000 to 9,499	53.
54.	8,500 to 8,999													8,500 to 8,999	54.
55.	8,000 to 8,499													8,000 to 8,499	55.
56.	7,500 to 7,999													7,500 to 7,999	56.
57.	7,000 to 7,499													7,000 to 7,499	57.
58.	6,500 to 6,999													6,500 to 6,999	58.
59.	6,000 to 6,499													6,000 to 6,499	59.
60.	Below $6,000													Below $6,000	60.
61.	Total													Total	61.

*Undesignated Rank

PART 4—FRINGE BENEFITS FOR FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY, 1976-77

Report the projected fringe-benefit expenditures which will be paid by your institution or State to the full-time instructional faculty during the 1976-77 academic year. Fringe benefits should be reported only for those salaried instructional faculty reported in Part 3 of this survey. The fringe benefits for male and female faculty on 9-month salaries, as reported in columns 1 and 5, lines 1-6 of Part 3A (page 8), should be reported in Part 4A. Similarly, the fringe benefits for male and female faculty in 11/12-month salaries reported in columns 1 and 5, lines 8-13 of Part 3B (page 8), should be reported in Part 4B. The exclusions cited in the instructions for Part 3 also apply to Parts 4A and 4B.

Fringe benefits are defined as cash contributions in the form of supplementary or deferred compensation other than salary. The employee's contribution should be excluded when determining the dollar value of fringe benefits. Expenditures should be reported to the nearest whole dollar. When an expenditure is reported for a fringe benefit, the number of persons covered by the expenditure must also be reported.

Fringe benefits are defined as follows:

Lines 1 and 2. RETIREMENT PLANS *(other than Social Security)*: Report contributions by your institution or State toward retirement. A vested plan provides that the full amount of the individual's, institution's, and State's contribution, with accumulations thereon, be made available as a benefit in case of death while in service, and with no forfeiture in case of withdrawal or dismissal from the institution.

On Line 1, report contributions toward retirement only to the extent that they become vested in the faculty member not later than the end of his 5th year of full-time service at the institution in the rank of instructor or higher, and are not lost to him if he leaves the institution or moves to another State.

On line 2, report contributions toward retirement plans which do not meet the vesting provisions stated above.

Line 3. HOSPITALIZATION, SURGICAL AND MEDICAL PLANS *(Basic and Major)*: Report projected expenditures for hospitalization plans providing for hospital room and services, surgical plans providing for a licensed surgeon, and basic and major medical plans providing for extensive medical expenses.

Line 4. GUARANTEED DISABILITY INCOME PROTECTION PLAN: Report expenditures through insurance or otherwise, for long-term disability income payments *(defined as salary in excess of 6 months)* and not covered in other retirement or insurance plans listed on this form. These payments are not to consist of the accumulation of unused annual sick leave benefits.

Line 5. TUITION PLAN: Report cash payments and the dollar value of tuition waivers and exchanges for children of faculty members to attend another institution or your own institution. If the tuition plan is available to all of the children of faculty members, and their children may attend any institution of their choice, please check "YES" on line 5. If either of these conditions does not apply, please check "NO" on line 5. The number covered by this benefit should be the number of faculty children receiving tuition, rather than the number of faculty members covered by the benefit.

If expenditures for tuition for the 1976-77 academic year cannot be anticipated when the report is being prepared, apply the current rate for this benefit to the number covered in 1975-76 to derive an estimate.

Line 6. HOUSING PLAN: Report the projected expenditures in the form of cash payments or subsidies to faculty members for off-campus or institution-owned housing. If faculty members have the option of choosing off-campus housing, please check "YES" on line 6. If the housing plan only applies to institution-owned housing, please check "NO" on line 6.

If expenditures for housing for the 1976-77 academic year cannot be anticipated when the report is being prepared, apply the current rate for this benefit to the number covered in 1975-76 to derive an estimate.

Line 7. SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES: If covered by Social Security, report the F.I.C.A. taxes calculated at the rate effective January 1, 1976.

Line 8. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION TAXES: Report the projected taxes (not benefits) to be paid under this law.

Line 9. GROUP LIFE INSURANCE: Report projected expenditures by the institution to support the group life insurance program.

Line 10. WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION: Report the projected taxes (not benefits) to be paid under this law.

Line 11. OTHER BENEFITS IN KIND WITH CASH OPTIONS: Personal benefits in kind are reported only if the faculty member has, without the imposition of conditions, the option of taking a cash payment if he prefers to use the money in some other way. Since the objective is the measurement of income available for personal consumption, as distinct from professional purposes, benefits of a professional nature *(such as convention travel, membership fees, grading assistance, faculty clubs, etc.)* should not be included.

Line 12. TOTALS: Sum the figures reported in each of the "Expenditure" columns.

The total "Number Covered" is an unduplicated count of persons covered by one or more benefit plans; not necessarily the sum of all figures reported in each of the "Number Covered" columns.

In the interest of consistent reporting, please verify that the number covered on each line of Part 4 does not exceed the corresponding number of men plus women reported in Part 3. For example, the "number covered" in Part 4A, line 1, column 2 should not exceed the number of persons reported in Part 3A (page 8, line 1, column 1 plus column 5. However, the number covered by the tuition plan, line 5, Part 4, may exceed the corresponding number of persons reported in Part 3 when faculty members have more than one child receiving tuition.

NAME OF INSTITUTION	1. INSTITUTION CODE NUMBER

PART 4A - FRINGE BENEFITS FOR FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY ON 9-MONTH SALARIES, 1976-77, MEN AND WOMEN

(In "Expenditure" columns, report only whole dollar amounts; omit cents)

FRINGE BENEFITS	LINE NO.	PROFESSORS		ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS		ASSISTANT PROFESSORS		INSTRUCTORS		LECTURERS		UNDESIGNATED RANK	
		EXPENDITURE (1)	NO. COV. (2)	EXPENDITURE (3)	NO. COV. (4)	EXPENDITURE (5)	NO. COV. (6)	EXPENDITURE (7)	NO. COV. (8)	EXPENDITURE (9)	NO. COV. (10)	EXPENDITURE (11)	NO. COV. (12)
RETIREMENT PLANS *(Other than Social Security)* A. VESTED	1												
B. NOT VESTED	2												
HOSPITALIZATION, SURGICAL AND MEDICAL PLANS *(Basic and Major)*	3												
GUARANTEED DISABILITY INCOME PROTECTION	4												
TUITION PLAN UNRESTRICTED ☐ YES ☐ NO *(see instruction for line 5)*	5												
HOUSING PLAN UNRESTRICTED ☐ YES ☐ NO *(see instruction for line 6)*	6												
SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES	7												
UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION TAXES	8												
GROUP LIFE INSURANCE	9												
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION	10												
OTHER BENEFITS IN KIND WITH CASH OPTIONS *(specify)*	11												
TOTALS (see instructions for line 12)	12												

REMARKS

-45-

57

58

NAME OF INSTITUTION

1. INSTITUTION CODE NUMBER

PART 4B - FRINGE BENEFITS FOR FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY ON 11/12-MONTH SALARIES, 1976-77, MEN AND WOMEN

(In "Expenditure" columns, report only whole dollar amounts; omit cents)

FRINGE BENEFITS	LINE NO.	PROFESSORS		ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS		ASSISTANT PROFESSORS		INSTRUCTORS		LECTURERS		UNDESIGNATED RANK	
		EXPENDITURE (1)	NO. COV. (2)	EXPENDITURE (3)	NO. COV. (4)	EXPENDITURE (5)	NO. COV. (6)	EXPENDITURE (7)	NO. COV. (8)	EXPENDITURE (9)	NO. COV. (10)	EXPENDITURE (11)	NO. COV. (12)
RETIREMENT PLANS *(Other than Social Security)* A. VESTED	1												
B. NOT VESTED	2												
HOSPITALIZATION, SURGICAL AND MEDICAL PLANS *(Basic and Major)*	3												
GUARANTEED DISABILITY INCOME PROTECTION	4												
TUITION PLAN UNRESTRICTED ☐ YES ☐ NO *(see instruction for line 5)*	5												
HOUSING PLAN UNRESTRICTED ☐ YES ☐ NO *(see instruction for line 6)*	6												
SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES	7												
UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION TAXES	8												
GROUP LIFE INSURANCE	9												
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION	10												
OTHER BENEFITS IN KIND WITH CASH OPTIONS *(specify)*	11												
TOTALS (see instructions for line 12)	12												

REMARKS